

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 30, 31, 33 and 34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 17, 30 and 31 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 50, line 16 to page 52, line 5 of the specification and in Figs. 5A-8B. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. May 7, 2008 Personal Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Milia and Zimmerman during the interview conducted on May 7, 2008. Applicants' separate record of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6-9, 11, 16-18, 21 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,142,318 (hereinafter "Lopez") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114002 (hereinafter "Mitsubori"), rejects claims 4-5, 10, 12-15 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Lopez in view of Mitsubori, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,182 (hereinafter "Nehab"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The combination of Lopez and Mitsubori fails to disclose, teach or suggest "a printing unit configured to **print the Web page accessed by the access unit and the access data extracted by the extraction unit**," (emphasis added) as recited by claim 1, and as similarly recited by claims 17, 30 and 31.

The Office Action alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Lopez and Mitsubori to provide a user with an entire Web page to allow for easy user interaction and selection of images, and therefore increase overall efficiency. Further, the Examiners alleged, during the May 7, 2008 personal

interview, that a web page could contain only a single image file, and thus at least one of the thumbnails printed on the proof sheet of Lopez and that corresponds to one of the qualified image files could itself constitute an entire web page. Thus, the Examiners alleged that Lopez discloses printing a web page.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Lopez discloses parsing the HTML source code file of a web page to identify image files associated with the web page that meet pre-designated criteria and printing indicia of the image files, which may be a thumbnail of the image or the image filename, on a proof sheet. Lopez further discloses an identity marker that identifies the thumbnail image and discloses that the identity marker is preferably the URL of the image.

Lopez explicitly discloses, as is well known in the art, that thumbnails are graphical representations of an image that are reduced in size and/or quality and are "sufficiently small so that an array of the same can be printed on a single sheet of paper for simultaneous viewing and evaluation by a user" (see col. 6, lines 4-8). Thus, the thumbnails are not the actual images that would be accessed by the image file URLs and Lopez fails to disclose printing an accessed web page.

Further, even if Lopez is interpreted as disclosing that the thumbnails of the images that are printed on the proof sheet represent the actual content of the image file URLs, Lopez fails to disclose printing a web page accessed by an access unit and access data extracted by an extraction unit, as recited by claim 1.

Based on the interpretation proffered by the Examiners during the May 7, 2008 interview, the thumbnail images could only plausibly be alleged to correspond to the access data of claim 1. Lopez fails to disclose printing both a web page and access data extracted from the web page because Lopez provides no disclosure of printing the web page 8 accessed by the internet access subsystem 70 from which the image files associated with the web page

8 are identified. Further, if the thumbnail images are alleged to correspond to the web page of claim 1, then Lopez provides no disclosure of printing access data extracted by an extraction unit.

Moreover, the object of the invention in Lopez is to allow a user to preview and select for printing digital images that are associated with Internet web pages without the need to attached a computer to the printing device. (See col. 2, lines 17-21). In order to achieve this object of the invention, Lopez discloses retrieving the image files associated with a web page, printing thumbnails of the images in an array on a proof sheet, and associating each thumbnail with a user designation area. (See col. 5, line 62 - col. 6, line18). Lopez discloses that the thumbnail images are displayed in an array to allow the user to quickly and easily select which of the digitally stored images ... that he or she wants to print." (See col. 6, lines 15-18).

Thus, combining the printing of an entire web page disclosed by Mitsubori with the proof sheet of Lopez renders Lopez unsuitable for its intended purpose of allowing users to quickly and easily select digital images for printing and actually makes results in a decrease in efficiency.

Further, Mitsubori and Nehab fail to cure the deficiencies of Lopez. In particular, Lopez, Mitsubori and Nehab, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest "a printing unit configured to **print the Web page accessed by the access unit and the access data extracted by the extraction unit**," (emphasis added) as recited by claim 1, and as similarly recited by claims 17, 30 and 31.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 17, 30 and 31 are patentable over the applied references taken in any combination. Dependent claims 2-16, 18-21, 33 and 34 are also patentable for at least their dependency from an independent claim as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Srikant Viswanadham
Registration No. 60,111

JAO:SQV/hms

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination

Date: May 12, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
